



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,245	07/09/2001	Riccardo Evangelisti	D-42837-01-US	4974
28236	7590	07/09/2004	EXAMINER	
CRYOVAC, INC. SEALED AIR CORP P.O. BOX 464 DUNCAN, SC 29334			STASHICK, ANTHONY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3728	

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/830,245

Applicant(s)

EVANGELISTI ET AL.

Examiner

Anthony D Stashick

Art Unit

3728

All Participants:

(1) Anthony D Stashick.

(2) Mark Quatt.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 07/07/2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

ANTHONY D. STASHICK
PRIMARY EXAMINER


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: This interview was given to correct and better understand the filing of the IDS on June 4, 2001 and July 4, 2001. Mr. Quatt informed the examiner that no IDS was filed that would correspond with the July 4 filing date. Paper NO. 3 was inadvertently noted as Paper No. 6, as paper no. 6 is an IDS stamped with the June 4, 2001 date. Therefore, it appears that paper Nos. 6 and 7 (6 the supposed IDS filed July 4, 2001 and 7 being the Priority Paper) were inadvertently entered into the wrong application and upon the correction of this, they were not removed from entry on the face of the file. Therefore, as it stands, no IDS stamped July 4, 2001 or priority paper stamped July 16, 2001, were submitted in the instant application.